IN THE HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE, ANDHRA PRADESH
AT HYDERABAD
(Special Original Jurisdiction)
WEDNESDAY, THE SEVENTH DAY OF JULY
TWO THOUSAND AND FOUR
PRESENT
THE HON'BLE MR JUSTICE N.V. RAMANA
WRIT PETITION NO : 10857 of 2004

Between:

Birju Raj Singh, S/o. Prithi Raj Singh,
R/o.14-10-215, Dhulpet, Hyderabad.

..... PETITIONER

AND

1 The Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, rep. by its Commissioner, Hyderabad.
2 The Asst. City Planner, Circle-II, Municipal Corporation, Hyderabad.

.RESPONDENT(S)

Petition under Article 226 of the constitution of India praying that in the circumstances stated in the Affidavit filed herein the High Court will be pleased to to issue order or orders or Writ more particularly one in the nature of Writ of Mandamus declaring the action of the respondents in not paying compensation to the acquired premesis bearing No.14-10-215, situated at Ghode-ki-khabar, Hyderabad acquired by the MCH authorities for Road widening works from Jumerath Bazatr to Gode-Ki-Khabar road as illegal and arbitrary and consequentially direct the respondent authorities to pay compensation for the acquired premesis or to handover possession back to the petitioner and py damages to a tune of Rs.60,000/- (Sixty thousand) to the petitioner

For the Petitioner:MR.M.L.ALI - Advocate

For the Respondents : MR.RAMA RAO GANTA –S.C. for M.C.H.

The Court at the stage of admission made the Following :

THE HON'BLE SRI JUSTICE N.V.RAMANA

WRIT PETITION NO. 10857 OF 2004

ORDER:

The present writ petition is filed questioning the action of the respondents in not paying the compensation to the petitioner for acquiring premises bearing No. 14-10-215 situated at Ghode-ki-khabar, Hyderabad, for road widening.

The petitioner claims to be owner of the subject property and with consent handed over the possession of the same to the respondents for road widening and stated to have submitted an application for payment of compensation on 10-4-2003. It is alleged that the respondent corporation has neither taken any steps for road widening nor paid any compensation for the property acquired. Hence, the writ petition.

The learned Standing Counsel for respondents, on instructions submitted that the respondent corporation is taking steps to demolish the subject building and that compensation would be paid to the petitioner, in accordance with law.

In view of the above statement made by the standing counsel for

respondent corporation, the writ petition is disposed of directing the respondent corporation to consider the claim of the petitioner for grant of compensation and pass appropriate orders in accordance with law, within a period of six weeks from the date of receipt of copy of this order.

_____

N.V.RAMANA,J

7-7-2004

TVK

To

1 The Municipal Corporation of Hyderabad, rep. by its Commissioner, Hyderabad.
2 The Asst. City Planner, Circle-II, Municipal Corporation, Hyderabad.
3.. 2CCs to
4.. .2CD copies

*Form-NIC-OGS/WP{**SPJS**}*